

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027

[JJP@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JJP@pisanellibice.com)

Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534

[TLB@pisanellibice.com](mailto:TLB@pisanellibice.com)

Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695

[DLS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:DLS@pisanellibice.com)

Jordan T. Smith, Esq., Bar No. 12097

[JTS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JTS@pisanellibice.com)

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

400 South 7th Street, Suite 300

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: 702.214.2100

Facsimile: 702.214.2101

*Counsel for Plaintiff Gypsum Resources, LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

GYPSUM RESOURCES, LLC, a Nevada  
limited liability company;

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY, a political subdivision of  
the State of Nevada; and CLARK COUNTY  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:19-cv-00850-GMN-EJY

**STIPULATION AND ORDER  
MODIFYING REFERRAL TO  
BANKRUPTCY COURT**

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

Plaintiff Gypsum Resources, LLC ("Gypsum") and Defendants Clark County and Clark County Board of Commissioners (collectively "Clark County"), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. On July 26, 2019, Plaintiff filed for bankruptcy protection under Chapter 11 of Title 11, Case No. 19-14799-mkn. *See* Docket No. 1 in Bankruptcy Case No. BK-S-19-14799-mkn (hereinafter "Bankruptcy Proceeding").

2. On November 7, 2019, following this Court's adoption in part of the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation, this Court entered an Order (ECF No. 28) that referred this matter "to the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada, as part of case Number BK-S-14796" (the "Referral Order").

3. This case then proceeded as 19-01105-MKN (the "Bankruptcy Adversary"). Bankruptcy Judge Michael Nakagawa has overseen the Bankruptcy Adversary, including discovery, since the referral. The Bankruptcy Court also entered a Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order, setting forth the discovery schedule and dispositive motions deadlines (the "Scheduling Order") (Ex. 1 hereto).

4. On July 16, 2021, Defendants filed a Motion (1) For Determination that the Claims at Issue Are Not Core Matters for Which the Bankruptcy Court may Issue Final Relief; (2) For Determination of Right to Jury Trial on Defendant's Counterclaim; and (3) To Return the Case to District Court for Final Adjudication (the "Motion"). (*See* Doc. No. 202.<sup>1</sup>) Defendants asserted that the claims raised in this action are "non-core" over which the Bankruptcy Court may exercise only "related to" jurisdiction; that the Bankruptcy Court is not authorized to conduct jury trials without the express consent of all parties, which is not present; and that the Bankruptcy Court lacks jurisdiction to issue final orders in this case, such that judicial economy would best be served by returning the case to District Court for determination of dispositive motions and for trial. Gypsum filed its Opposition on August 4, 2021. (*See* Doc. No. 208.) Defendants filed their Reply on August 11, 2021. (*See* Doc. No. 210.)

---

<sup>1</sup> "Doc. No." references refer to the documents filed in Case No. BK-S-19-14796-mkn.

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

1           5.       The deadline for filing dispositive motions in the Bankruptcy Adversary was  
2       September 20, 2021. Defendants have filed a Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 242 in  
3       the Bankruptcy Adversary) and Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment  
4       (Docket No. 247 in the Bankruptcy Adversary) (collectively, the "Summary Judgment Motions").

5           6.       On September 21, 2021, the Bankruptcy Court issued its Order on Motion (1) For  
6       Determination that the Claims at Issue Are Not Core Matters for Which the Bankruptcy Court may  
7       Issue Final Relief; (2) For Determination of Right to Jury Trial on Defendant's Counterclaim; and  
8       (3) To Return the Case to District Court for Final Adjudication. (*See* Doc. No. 254.)

9           7.       In relevant part, the Bankruptcy Court "ordered and determined that the claims  
10       alleged by Plaintiff and Defendants in the above-captioned proceedings are non-core matters within  
11       the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b) and that consent to have the bankruptcy court enter a final  
12       judgment on such claims has not been given." (*Id.* at 17.)

13           8.       The Bankruptcy Court's Order stayed the Bankruptcy Adversary to permit the  
14       Defendants to seek a determination of whether the Referral Order should be modified or withdrawn.  
15       (*Id.* at 16.)

16           9.       In light of the Bankruptcy Court's Order, which questions its authority to rule upon  
17       motions for summary judgment, the Parties do not wish to create any debate about the  
18       Bankruptcy Court's authority to resolve motions for summary judgment – which both sides have  
19       filed in accordance with the Scheduling Order – so as to prolong this case.

20           10.      The parties further stipulate to the following briefing schedule on their respective  
21       motions for summary judgment: Oppositions shall be due on or before October 22, 2021. Replies  
22       shall be due on or before November 22, 2021.

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

11. In the interest of judicial economy and to avoid debates about the Bankruptcy Court's authority to enter final judgment in the case, Plaintiff withdraws its opposition to returning this case to the District Court for final adjudication, including motions for summary judgment, and the Parties jointly stipulate to now withdraw the referral to Bankruptcy Court and return this case to the District Court.

Respectfully submitted this 5th day of  
October, 2021.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

By: /s/ Todd L. Bice

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., #4027  
Todd L. Bice, Esq., #4534  
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., #9695  
Jordan T. Smith, Esq., #12097  
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Gypsum Resources, LLC*

Respectfully submitted this 5th day of  
October, 2021.

OLSON CANON GORMLEY & STOBERSKI

By: /s/ Thomas D. Dillard, Jr.

Thomas D. Dillard, Jr. Esq., #6270  
Stephanie A. Barker, Esq., #3176  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, NV 89129


DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
Robert T. Warhola, Esq., #4410  
500 Grand Central Parkway  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**IS IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties shall file a copy of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and a copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the District Court's docket no later than October 15, 2021.

Dated this 7 day of October, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# **EXHIBIT 1**

Electronically Filed October 22, 2019

KEVIN H. BROGAN (Cal. Bar #089427)  
 HILL, FARRER & BURRILL, LLP  
 One California Plaza, 37<sup>th</sup> floor  
 300 South Grand Avenue  
 Los Angeles, California 90071  
 Telephone: (213) 620-0460  
 Facsimile: (213) 624-4840  
 Email: kbrogan@hfbllp.com  
 (Pro Hac Vice)

BRETT A. AXELROD, ESQ.  
 Nevada Bar No. 5859  
**FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**  
 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 700  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
 Telephone: (702) 262-6899  
 Facsimile: (702) 597-5503  
 Email: baxelrod@foxrothschild.com  
*Counsel for Gypsum Resources, LLC*

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

In re

GYPSUM RESOURCES MATERIALS,  
 LLC,

- ☐ Affects Gypsum Resources Materials, LLC  
☒ Affects Gypsum Resources, LLC  
☐ Affects all Debtors

GYPSUM RESOURCES, LLC, a Nevada limited  
 liability company;

Plaintiff,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY, a political subdivision of the  
 State of Nevada; and CLARK COUNTY  
 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,

Defendants.

Case No. BK-S-19-14796-mkn

Jointly Administered with  
 Case No. BK-S-19-14799-mkn

Chapter 11

Adversary Proceeding No. 19-01105-mkn  
**STIPULATED DISCOVERY PLAN AND**  
**[PROPOSED] SCHEDULING ORDER**  
**[SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW**  
**REQUESTED]**

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP  
 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 700  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
 (702) 262-6899  
 (702) 597-5503 (fax)

1. **Meetings.** Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f), a meeting was held telephonically on October 15, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. and was attended by:

Kevin Brogan for plaintiff

Tom Dillard for defendants

The parties note that they previously held a meeting concerning the stipulated discovery plan submitted to the District Court on September 24, 2019. The District Court denied the Stipulated Discovery Plan and [Proposed] Scheduling Order, docketed at ESF No. 24, due to the referral to the Bankruptcy Court.

2. **Pre-Discovery Disclosures.** The parties will exchange by October 23, 2019 the information required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1) and Local Rule 26-1.

3. **Discovery Plan**

X A discovery plan is needed or useful in this case.

X The parties cannot agree on a discovery plan and scheduling order. The attached sets forth the parties' disagreements and reasons for each party's position.

A. Plaintiff states discovery will be needed on the following subjects: the subject property, state legislation and prior attempt at acquisition of plaintiff's property, the settlement agreement resulting from litigation, plaintiff's attempts at obtaining development entitlements to develop the property, defendants' responses to the requests for entitlement, communications between and among the plaintiff and defendants, and, if liability is found, expert valuation evidence.

Defendants state that they object to discovery with respect to the formation and the terms and conditions of the prior settlement agreement as all such issues were waived under the settlement agreement. Defendants otherwise agree and further state that discovery is needed regarding the due diligence and viability of the proposals in the specific plan submitted by Plaintiff concerning the subject property, present mining operations and manufacturing plant operations and impact on the property of such operations, Plaintiff's plan to retake disturbed areas of the property, status of the access to the property across lands held by the United States and maintained by the Bureau of Land Management, efforts and status of Plaintiff securing a right-of-way to provide access to the property, status of environmental studies, plans and viability for access to all utilities and municipal

services to the property from Plaintiffs and from third parties and discovery and what Plaintiffs have done with respect to representations made to conduct studies on slope and gradient, current and future planned mining operations and impacts, surface hydrology, soils and geology, elevation, flora and fauna, access and historic roadways and infrastructure (existing and proposed).

B. The parties cannot agree on a completion date for discovery. Plaintiff contends that non-expert discovery can be completed by February 3, 2020. Defendants contend that non-expert discovery can be completed by July 6, 2020.

C. The parties agree that the maximum number of interrogatories by each party to any other party shall be seventy-five (75). Responses will be due thirty (30) days after service.

D. The parties agree that the maximum number of requests for admission by each party to any other party shall be seventy-five (75). Responses will be due thirty (30) days after service.

E. The parties agree that the maximum number of non-expert depositions by plaintiff shall be twenty (20) and the maximum number of non-expert depositions by defendant shall be twenty (20). Each non-expert deposition shall be limited to maximum of seven (7) hours unless extended by agreement of parties.

F. The parties agree that the reports from retained experts under Rule 26(a)(2) shall be due thirty (30) days after the completion date for discovery. Supplementations under Rule 26(e) are due within thirty (30) days after the exchange of initial reports.

4. **Jury Trial: Check one:**

☐ A demand for a jury trial has not been made

☒ A demand for a jury trial has been made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), and in conformity with LR 9015, but plaintiff does not consent to a jury trial pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(e). An original and two (2) copies of all instructions requested by either party shall be submitted to the clerk for filing on or before ten (10) days before the start of trial. An original and two (2) copies of all suggested questions of the parties to be asked of the jury panel by the court on voir dire shall be submitted to the clerk for filing on or before ten (10) days before the start of trial.



5. **Other Items.**

A. The parties request a conference with the court before entry of the scheduling order.

B. Plaintiff requests a pretrial conference in May 2020. Defendants request a pretrial conference in October 2020.

C. Plaintiff and Defendants should be allowed until thirty (30) days after the completion date for discovery to join additional parties or to amend their pleadings.

D. All potentially dispositive motions should be filed by sixty (60) days after the completion date for discovery.

E. Defendants contend settlement cannot be evaluated prior to January 1, 2020.

Plaintiffs would like to have Hon. Greg Zive as a potential settlement judge.

F. Final lists of witnesses and exhibits under Rule 26(a)(3) should be due: sixty (60) days after the completion date for discovery. Parties should have thirty (30) days after service of final lists of witnesses and exhibits to list objections under Rule 26(a)(3).

G. Trial. Plaintiff contends the case should be ready for trial by June 2020 and at this time is expected to take approximately ten (10) days. Defendants contend the case should be ready for trial by November 2020 and agree with Plaintiff's estimate that it is expected to take approximately ten (10) days.

H. Pending Motions. There are two fully briefed matters pending including a motion to dismiss Defendant Clark County Board of Commissioners and a motion for partial judgment on the pleadings with respect to the claims made under the Equal Protection Clause and a separate claim pled under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.

6. **Other matters**

A. At this time, the parties believe that discovery of electronically stored information should be made in native format. The parties agree to preserve such information.

///

///

///

///

1 B. The parties agreed that any inadvertently produced privileged material would not  
2 lose its privileged status, provided prompt disclosure of the existence of the inadvertently produced  
3 privileged material is made.

4 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of October 2019.

5  
6 HILL, FARRER & BURRILL, LLP

7 By: 

8 Kevin H. Brogan (Cal. Bar #089427  
9 One California Plaza, 37<sup>th</sup> floor  
300 South Grand Avenue  
10 Los Angeles, California 90071  
(Pro Hac Vice)

11 Brett A. Axelrod, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 5859

12 **FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**

13 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 700  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

14 *Counsel for Gypsum Resources, LLC*

OLSON, CANON, GORMLEY NAGULO &  
STOBERSKI

By: 

Thomas D. Dillard (#006270)  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Robert T. Warhola (#004410)

500 Grand Central Pkwy  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

Attorneys for Defendants

*Clark County and Clark County Board of  
Commissioners*